UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,501	06/19/2001	Jeffrey A. Bedell	53470.003041	8690

21967   7590   12/15/2004

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AVAILABLE COPY

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/883,501	BEDELL ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Maikhanh Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _19 June 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _19 June 2001_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _9/24/02 & 9/25/02_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the following communications: original application filed

06/19/2001; IDS filed 09/24/2002 and 09/25/2002.

2.   Claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 9 and 16 are independent

claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement filed 9/25/02 fails to comply with the

provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because some documents are not

included in the CD as cited and some have no date. It has been placed in the application

file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits.

Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information

contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing

element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with

the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification

requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 C (1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   Claims 1-6, 8-12 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over **McCann et al.** (U.S. 5,963,939 – issued 10/1999).

As to independent claim 9:

a.   McCann teaches a method for resolving reports that include prompt objects *(e.g.,*

the question block objects; col.23, lines 34-62), wherein the prompt objects

comprise a question to be asked of a user *(e.g., objects to prompt a user for*

responses that provide information to the question block; col.23, lines 30-62) and

at least one validation property *(e.g., searchable fields or properties; col.23, line*

63-col.4, line 6 and also see Fig.9), the method comprising the steps of:

   (i)   receiving a report instance at a server system from a client *(Fig.45)* that

          has initiated report execution of the report that includes one or more

          prompt objects *(items 556 and 558 in Fig. 45)*;

   (ii)   gathering at the server system the one or more prompt objects referenced

          in the report *(item 562 in Fig.45)*;

   (iii)   generating a resolution object *(e.g., generating a Solutions Object 400a;*

          col.7, lines 51-63 and Fig. 22F) containing the one or more questions

from the one or more prompt object gathered *(e.g., the Question Block*

Base Class 100; col.23, lines 30-43 and Figs. 58A-58V);

(iv)   interacting with a user to receive answers to one or more questions *(e.g.,*

question block 'user interface' objects ...obtaining the needed information

from the user ... the user enters data in response to questions; col.23, lines

35-62 and Figs. 58A-58V) in the resolution object; and

b.   While McCann does teach a report having prompt objects and receiving answers

from a user to the one or more questions in the resolution object *(see Fig. 58)*,

McCann does not explicitly teach "executing".

c.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to have applied McCann's teaching to include executing the

report because it would have provided the capability for allowing the user to

submit over the Internet all or some of products that they desire to purchase to the

manufacturer, supplier, or distributor.

d.   The fact that McCann's teachings "submit purchase order" (Fig. 57) and purpose

of submitting purchase order in McCann suggests "executing".

As to dependent claim 10:

McCann teaches gathering prompt objects comprise using an object server to retrieve the

prompt objects from a metadata repository *(col.69, lines 21-41)*.

As to dependent claim 11:

McCann teaches merging multiple instances of the same prompt object in a report to provide a single question for those prompt objects in the resolution object *(col.24, lines 32-51 and col.66, lines 31-41)*.

As to dependent claim 12:

McCann teaches receiving an answer to the single question for multiple instances of the same prompt and apply the answer to each instance of the prompt object in the report *(Fig.45)*.

As to dependent claim 14:

McCann teaches report instance comprises one or more origin application objects that include the prompt objects *(e.g., objects to prompt a user for responses that provide information to the question block; col.23, lines 30-62)*; and wherein the resolution server uses the resolution object to generate filled in application objects with the answers from the resolution object in place of prompts objects in the origin application object *(col.7, line 51-col.8, line 2 and col.15, line 46-66)*.

As to dependent claim 15:

McCann teaches prompting the user to answer the questions from the prompt object server over a web interface *(col.25, lines 22-41 and Figs. 58A-58V, a set of question procedures)*.

As to independent claim 1:

It is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 9, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 2:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 10, and is similarly rejected under the same

rationale.

As to dependent claim 3:

McCann teaches the report prompt interaction means is part of a client system connected

over a network to a server system *(col.27, lines 41 and col.52, lines 37-42)*, and the

server system comprises the receiving means, the report server, the object server, and the

report execution means *(Fig. 57)*.

As to dependent claim 4:

McCann teaches the report prompt interaction means comprises a web server that

interaction with a user (col.23, lines 30-62 and *col.25, line 62-col.26, line 7)*.

As to dependent claims 5-8:

They include the same limitations as in claim 11-14, and are similarly rejected under the

same rationale.

<u>As to independent claim 16:</u>

It is directed to a medium for implementing the method of claim 9, and is similarly

rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 17:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 10, and is similarly rejected under the same

rationale.

As to dependent claim 18:

McCann teaches merging multiple instances of the same prompt object in a report to

provide a single question for those prompt objects in the resolution object *(col.24, lines*

32-51 and col.66, lines 31-41); and receiving an answer to the single question for

multiple instances of the same prompt and apply the answer to each instance of the

prompt object in the report *(Fig.45).*

As to dependent claim 19:

McCann teaches a process to generate filled in application objects with the answers from

the resolution object in place of prompts objects in the origin application object *(col.7,*

line 51-col.8, line 2 and col.15, line 46-66).

As to dependent claim 20:

McCann teaches a web server to interact with the user to obtain answers to one or more

prompt questions *(e.g., obtain a client identifier from the user ... includes questions and*

other processes ... at the user's browser; col.25, line 62-col.26, line 7).

6.   Claims 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **McCann**

et al. in view of **Poggi** (U.S. 6,569,205 – filed 07/1997).

As to dependent claims 7 and 13:

a.   McCann does not explicitly teach "the report server checks for cached reports

        prior to report execution."

b.   Poggi teaches the report server checks for cached reports prior to report execution

        (col. 4, lines 37-49 and Fig.6).

c.   It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

        invention was made to combine the teachings of Poggi and McCann because it

would have provided the capability for presentation and navigation in a computer

system that includes multiple reports about multiple components.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Campbell et al.	U.S Patent No. 6,292,801	issued: Sep. 18, 2001
Ruppelt	U.S Patent No. 6,571,236	issued: May 27, 2003
Thompson et al.	U.S Patent No. 6,668,253	issued: Dec. 23, 2003
Dardinski et al.	U.S Patent No. 6,754,885	issued: Jun. 22, 2004

Jancsek, "Using Technology to Modernize loan review at BankAmerica Corporation",

Commercial Lending Review, Spring 1997, Vol.12, page 13, 5 pgs.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30

pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
December 1, 2004

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER